



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Joseph A. Rhoa, Esq.  
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington VA 22201-4714

**COPY MAILED**

OCT 09 2007

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Richard B. Strachan  
Application No. 10/051,139  
Filed: 01/22/2002  
Attorney Docket No. 3714-3

**DECISION ON PETITION**

This is decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.181, filed May 11, 2007, to withdraw the holding of abandonment.

This application became abandoned for failure to reply timely to the nonfinal Office Action mailed October 11, 2006, which set a three (3) month shortened statutory period to reply. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on January 12, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on May 4, 2007.

Applicant asserted he did not receive the nonfinal Office Action of October 11, 2006, and thus, requested withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. The practitioner and applicant stated that they searched the file jacket and docket records relating to the application; however, the search revealed that they did not receive the Office Action dated October 11, 2006. In support of the assertion, applicant submitted copies of the docket records. Specifically, applicant stated that the docket sheets, last updated December 28, 2006, showed a Call-Up to be done on June 28, 2007, to determine if an Office Action was received. Thus, applicant averred that the docket sheets clearly indicated that the Office Action of October 11, 2006, was not received.

After reviewing the USPTO records, it appears that the address of record, where the nonfinal Office Action was mailed, differs from the address listed on the petition. There is nothing in the record to show that the practitioner or applicant submitted a change of correspondence address with the USPTO prior to the mailing of the nonfinal Office Action of October 11, 2006, and thus, the communication was returned to the USPTO.

As the record reveals that neither the practitioner nor applicant submitted a change of correspondence address, the USPTO mailed the nonfinal Office Action of October 11, 2006, to the correct correspondence address, as it existed on record at that time. Accordingly, the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment is **dismissed**. A copy of the nonfinal Office Action accompanies this decision for applicant's convenience.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time are permitted under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The request for reconsideration should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.181."

If applicant cannot supply the evidence necessary to withdraw the holding of abandonment, or simply does not wish to, applicant may wish to file a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) accompanied by a reply to the outstanding Office Action, a \$770.00 petition fee for a small entity, and an appropriate statement of unintentional delay. The filing of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed, and therefore, must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

As a one-time courtesy the Office is mailing a carbon copy of this decision to the address listed on the petition. Thereafter, all Office communications will be mailed to the address of record unless applicant files a proper change of correspondence address with the USPTO.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:      Mail Stop Petition  
                  Commissioner for Patents  
                  P.O. Box 1450  
                  Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX:      (571) 273-8300  
                  Attn: Office of Petition

By hand:      Customer Service Window  
                  Randolph Building  
                  401 Dulany Street  
                  Alexandria, VA 22314

Correspondence regarding this decision may also be filed through the Electronic Filing System of the USPTO.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3211.

*Christina Tartera Donnell*

Christina Tartera Donnell  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions

Attachment: Copy of Nonfinal Office Action

Cc: Joseph A. Rhoa, Esq.  
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,139	01/22/2002	Richard B. Strachan	3714-3	9802
7590	10/11/2006		EXAMINER	
Joseph A. Rhoa, Esq. NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C. 1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor Arlington, VA 22201-4714			FISHER, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/051,139	STRACHAN, RICHARD B.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Michael J. Fisher	3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 6-8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1, 3,5,6 of U. S. Patent No. 6,347,086 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a method of wagering. Claim 6 of the instant application is generally the same as claims 1, 5 and 6. Claim 7 of the instant application is contained in claim 1 and claim 8 is generally the same as claim 3 of the patent. The difference being that in the patent the server is causing the events to happen, in the instant application it is unclear who or what is causing the actions, who or what performs the steps would not make the invention patentably distinct unless the applicant could point out exactly why this would make it patentably distinct.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See MPEP § 804.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Fisher whose telephone number is 571-272-6804. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30am-5:00pm alt Fri. off.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael J. Fisher



Patent Examiner  
GAU 3629

MF   
9/26/06